Case: 4:16-cv-00814-RWS Doc. #: 20 Filed: 08/09/16 Page: 1 of 2 PageID #: 97

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

DAMON T. DORRIS,)
Debtor,) Case No. 4:16 CV 814 RWS
CRITIQUE SERVICES, L.L.C., et a	/) al.,)
) Bankruptcy Case No. 16-40251-659
Appellants,)
) Adv. Case No. 16-4025-659
v.)
)
DANIEL J. CASAMATTA,)
Acting United States Trustee,)
)
Appellee.)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Appellants have filed this appeal seeking to overturn an order of the bankruptcy court denying a motion to approve a settlement agreement. The proposed settlement arose in an adversary proceeding between Appellants Critique Services and Beverly Holmes Diltz and Appellee Acting United States Trustee Daniel Casamatta. The bankruptcy court held a hearing and denied the proposed settlement because the document failed to address, among other issues, mechanisms by which clients would obtain their client files and the status or possible dissolution of the Critique business entity. The bankruptcy court continued the settlement hearing and anticipated the parties would file an amended settlement agreement for the court's consideration. Instead of addressing the

bankruptcy court's concerns, the Appellants filed the present appeal of the bankruptcy court's ruling.

Appellants' appeal fails for two reasons. First, this Court lacks jurisdiction to entertain the appeal because it is interlocutory and not a final order or judgment. See 28 § 158(a)(1). The bankruptcy court's order simply addressed a proposed settlement. The order is not a final decision on the merits of the adversary proceeding. Roach v. Churchman, 457 F.2d 1101 (8th Cir. 1972)(denial of consent judgment not an appealable order).

Second, there does not appear to be any legitimate ground to entertain this interlocutory appeal under the Court's discretionary powers pursuant to 28 § 158(a)(3). As a result, I will dismiss this appeal.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Appellee's motion to dismiss this appeal [14] is **GRANTED**. All other pending motions are denied as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Appellants' appeal is hereby **DISMISSED**.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 9th day of August, 2016.